



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

that "from a child he had known the Holy Scriptures:" but it seems the Roman Catholics of Ireland are forbidden, by the united voice of the bishops of their Church, to read the Word of God, until they arrive at "mature years." In the education of youth, at least, the Holy Scriptures are to be a prohibited book, with some honourable exceptions, such as that mentioned in a former number of our journal, to the honour of Dr. Browne, Roman Catholic Bishop of Kilmore, Ireland, as we have seen, was looked upon in ancient times as "a nation famous for the Word of God;" but if the Bull "Unigenitus" is to be enforced among us—if every person who maintains that "the reading of the Sacred Scripture is for all," is to be forthwith denounced as "impious, blasphemous, and heretical," and "deserving of the indignation of God Almighty, and of the blessed Apostles, St. Peter and St. Paul," it needs but little wisdom to foresee that, in this point at least, our land will never again be deserving of its ancient renown.

Our limits warn us that we must conclude: and it is a relief to turn from the angry denunciations we have just quoted, to the sweet and touching words which that holy and ancient Father, St. Augustine, addressed to the Christians of his day—"We are brethren: why do we strive? Our Father died not intestate; he made a testament, and so died. Men do strive about the goods of the dead, till the testament be brought forth; when that is brought, they yield to have it opened and read; the judge doth hearken, the counsellors be silent, the crier biddeth peace, and all the people are attentive, that the words of the dead may be read and heard. He lieth, void of life, and feeling, in his grave, and his words prevail. Christ doth sit in heaven; and is his testament gainsayed? Open it; let us read, we are brethren; why do we strive? Let our minds be pacified; our Father hath not left us without a testament; he that made the testament is living for ever. He doth hear our words, he doth know His own words; let us read: why do we strive?"*

UNITY OF SPIRIT IN THE BOND OF PEACE.—The devil being an apostate spirit, revolted and separated from God, doth naturally project and work division. This was his first exploit, and is still his grand design in the world. And as the devil's work is division, Christ's work is union. He came to dissolve the works of the devil by a contrary work.—1 John iii. 8. He came to make all friends; to re-collect and unite all men to God, and man to man. This was his great project; this he died and suffered for, and this he prayed for.—John xvii. The love of our brethren is not another from the love of God; it is but the streaming forth of it, or the reflection of it. God allows, nay, commands and causes that it stream forth, remaining still in him, as in its source and centre; beginning at him and returning to him, as the beams that diffuse themselves from the sun, and the light and heat yet are not divided or cut off from it, but remain in it, while by emanation they issue from it. The love of God makes us one with God, and, dwelling in the heart, enlarges and dilates it, as self-love contracts and straitens it. The bitter root of all enmity in man against God, and amongst men, against one another, is self—man's heart turned from God towards himself. Whence is it that wars, and contests, and mutual disgracings and despisings do so much abound, but that men love themselves, and nothing but themselves, or in relation to themselves, as it pleases, or is advantageous to them? That is the standard and rule. All is carried by interest; thence strifes, and defamings, and bitterness against one another. Nothing short of the Spirit of Christ can undo this selfishness. But let that spirit once dwell in thy heart, and to forgive a wrong, to love even an enemy, will be not only possible, but delightful. The spirit of Christ, which is all sweetness and love, so calms and composes the heart, and fills the soul with lovingness, that it can breathe nothing else. It hates nothing but sin; it pities the sinner, and carries towards the worst that love of good will, desiring their return and salvation. But as for those, in whom appears the image of their Father, their heart cleaves to them as brethren indeed. No natural advantages of birth, beauty, or wit, draw a Christian's love so much as the resemblance of Christ; wherever that is found, it is comely and lovely in the soul that loves him.—*Archbishop Leighton.*

* Aug. Op., tom. iv., p. 102. Paris, 1681.

PURGATORY.

We think we may confidently appeal to those readers who have candidly perused the articles on this subject in our former numbers, to testify that we have kept our promise of discussing this momentous subject with a serious regard for the feelings and opinions of others who have been educated in an undoubting belief of the doctrine of the Church of Rome upon it. One class alone can possibly have taken offence at what we have said, even though dissenting from the views we have suggested. We mean the clergy, who not only derive a lucrative traffic from the popular belief, but must needs enjoy thereby a greater authority over that numerous class of persons who are conscious that they do not live so innocently as to be out of danger of purgatorial punishment, and who would, therefore, willingly resort to any means held out to them by their clergy to escape from it. Masses for the dead and indulgences have, no doubt, been of immense importance to the treasury of the Church, whether the laity have derived an equivalent benefit from them or not. That any class of men should take umbrage at a discussion which directly concerns their pecuniary gains, is natural enough; and we are not surprised that priests should endeavour to deter the laity from considering or discussing such a subject, if they give them credit for as much intelligence as we do, and do not feel very sure of successfully maintaining the truth of their doctrines on the calm and full discussion to which we invited and challenged them in our first number. We write, however, for laymen who desire to read and think, and arrive at truth for themselves; and we firmly believe that every attempt to reduce them to slavish credulity previous to examination, will recoil upon those who are weak enough to resort to it.

We shall now proceed to show that the doctrine of Purgatory is neither a truth founded on Scripture or reason, nor even on tradition, or the unanimous testimony of the Fathers of the Church. As we commenced with that branch of our subject in our last number, we shall take the Fathers first. We have already produced, what we think to be a strong argument, that St. Patrick himself was not aware of it, and did not believe in its existence. That such a treatise as that on the Three Habitations should have been for so many centuries attributed to St. Patrick, whether rightly or not, proves, at least, that the views suggested in it could not have been considered heretical or unsound by the early Church of Ireland. We are the less surprised that the early Church were ignorant of this doctrine, from finding that St. Leo the Great, who was himself Pope in St. Patrick's time, and whose voluminous writings have been published in two large quarto volumes, appears to have known nothing of the modern doctrine, that there was any mode of expurgating, after death, what during life had been left unsatisfied, either in the way of guilt or punishment; for in his Epistle to Theodore, Bishop of Friuli, dated 10th June, 452, speaking of the penitents who had not performed all their acts of penance (or repentance), and thereby received the remission of their sins through that indulgence of God (indulgentia Dei), which cannot (he says) be obtained without the prayers of the priests, he goes on thus (chap. 3)—"But if any one of them for whom we pray unto the Lord, being intercepted by any obstacle, shall fall from the gift of the present indulgence (before spoken of), and, before he arrives at the appointed remedies, ends his temporal life, that which remaining in the body he hath not received, when he is divested of his body, he cannot obtain."* What is this but to say, that though the Lord had delivered to the Church the power of giving ecclesiastical absolution to persons who were penitent, and desirous of being cleansed from their sins (*salubri satisfactione purgatos*), that power was confined to the present life, and could not be, after death, granted even to the supplication of the priests?

Surely it is not possible to believe that St. Leo would have thus written, if he had known that there was a place where penitents and believers, who had not performed all their penances in this life, could be purged or cleansed, either by their own sufferings, or by the supplications of the clergy or of their surviving friends? St. Leo obviously knew nothing of any such doctrine as that of satisfying in purgatory what had not been paid or completed in this life; and, therefore, we conclude, that no such doctrine as purgatory was handed down by tradition from the time of the Apostles, as otherwise so great a man as St. Leo the Great could not have passed it over without distinctly noticing it. Should we have overlooked any passage in St. Leo's works which may tend to throw light upon the subject, we shall feel obliged to any among the learned who will be good enough to furnish us with a reference to it.

St. Leo and St. Patrick, however, do not by any means

stand alone in the views we have expressed; for it is remarkable that several of the ancient Fathers utterly deny that the soul is capable of being purged in another world. St. Gregory Nazianzen, who died A. D. 389, was the most profound scholar of his age, and won from all his contemporaries the prize of eloquence, excelling them (to use the language of Dupin, himself a learned Roman Catholic divine), "in the purity of his words, the nobleness of his expressions, the ornaments of his discourse, the variety of his figures, the justness of his comparisons, the beauty of his reasonings, and the sublimity of his thoughts." This eminent Father of the Church was successively Bishop of Sasimi, Nazianzus, and Constantinople; and living still nearer to the times of the Apostles, could not have been ignorant of such a doctrine as that of purgatory, had any such thing been known in the Church. Most, if not all, of his works are extant (and have undergone a variety of editions), consisting of about fifty orations or sermons, besides letters and poems; and yet, so far from any reference to such a doctrine being found in his works, he, in fact, as directly and formally denies that there is any purgatory in the next life, as any writer could do in an age when the doctrine subsequently introduced was really unknown. After speaking of the scourges by which God purifies man in this life, he adds, in his xvi. Orat.—"It is better to be chastised and purged now (in life) than to be delivered to that torture (after death), since then shall be the time of punishment, not of expurgation,"* expressly contrasting the time of purgation in this life with the time, not of purgation, but of punishment, in the next. How could St. Gregory have thus written, if he knew the doctrine of the Church was, that the departed souls, even of the redeemed, must be purified in purgatory before reaching heaven?

St. Chrysostom, who died A. D. 407, was of the same opinion, for he says, in his Homily de Penitentia—"If the soul be purged here that fire shall not hurt it when it departs hence; but the soul that goes hence in sin, that fire shall receive"—meaning not the fire of purgatory, which he never names, but that of hell (*Gehennae*), which he had named immediately before.†

To these we might add, but for fear of becoming tedious, St. Cyril of Alexandria, tom. iv., book 12, p. 1069: Paris, 1638. St. Cyprian De Mortalitate, sec. ii., p. 157: Oxford, 1682. St. Hilary on the 120th Psalm, p. 978: Paris, 1652; and several others.

Such was the doctrine of those early ages, when, if tradition from the Apostles ever taught Divine truths distinct from those contained in the Holy Scriptures, they could not have been unknown to the Pope and eminent Fathers we have referred to. Their doctrine was simply that which the Scriptures still teach—viz., the soul that is clear of sin by God's pardon and forgiveness, through the merits of Christ's atoning sacrifice, no fire can hurt; the soul that is not so forgiven, no fire can cleanse. Christ, in fact, does not do his work of atonement by halves—remitting the guilt, and yet leaving the punishment! Where the guilt is removed, the punishment is so likewise, temporal as well as eternal. Tertullian, Chrysostom, Augustine, all say this; and even St. Bernard, in speaking of the completeness of the Divine pardon, says—"Some there are who forgive injury, so as not to revenge it, but still they upbraid; others there are who are silent, though somewhat remains deeply rooted in their minds, and they retain inward rancour. In neither case is there a full pardon. Far from these is the benignant nature of the Godhead—HE ACTS WITH LIBERALITY—HE FORGIVES ENTIRELY."‡

In corroboration of these views we would observe, that we can find no mention of purgation after death in any of the ancient creeds, or councils, or catechetical discourses, in which the other articles of faith are set down and explained. The fifth general council, which, A. D. 553, condemned Origen for his errors concerning those pains after death which he conceived restored even the damned, never mentioned any other purgatory in opposition to that which he had heretically invented, nor did any of the Fathers who disputed with Origen mention any of the purgatory pains which the orthodox faith taught, to distinguish them from those which he erroneously had invented, as they surely could not have failed to do, if such had been then firmly believed by the Church. The fact is, that at a later period Pope Gregory—who died A. D. 604—though he gave considerable countenance to this doctrine, spoke of it with some doubt, not as a point even then firmly resolved by the Church, though no doubt it had, within the preceding two centuries, gained some little credit among the clergy of the west, especially among the monastic orders; and was soon after, under the sanction of Pope Gregory, eagerly seized on by the Benedictine monks, and found so

* Sancti Leonis Magni Opera, tom. i., page 695. Lutet. Paris, 1675.

Epistola 82 ad Theodorum Forojuliensem Episcopum (A. D. 452, 10 Junii.)

Cap. iii. "Si autem aliquis eorum, pro quibus Domino supplicamus quocumque intercepto obstaculo à munere indulgentie presentis, exciderit (alias excesserit) marq; et priusquam ad constituta remedia perveniat temporalem vitam humana conditione finiret, quod manens in corpore non recepit, consequi crucis carne non poterit."

* Orat. xvi. tom. i., pp. 304, 305.

† Chrysostomi de Penitentia, Homil. vi., Oper. Omo., tom. ii., p. 320. Paris, 1718. Benedictine Edit. (We give the Latin translation.)

‡ Hic igne examinamus, verbo scilicet doctrine, quo minus idipsum cogatur Gehennae igne. Nam purgatum animam hinc abeuntem, ille non laedit ignis; eam autem que cum peccatis hinc abierit ille ignis excipiet. Unius culmoque enim opus quod, inquit, sit, ignis probabit.—1 Cor. iii. 13.

§ Bernard Sermo de Fragmentis, col. 300, Oper. ed Paris, 1586.